

AF/2841
ZFW

AGILENT TECHNOLOGIES, INC.
Legal Department, DL429
Intellectual Property Administration
P.O. Box 7599
Coveland, Colorado 80537-0599

ATTORNEY DOCKET NO. 10010255-1



IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

Inventor(s): John C. Eidson et al.

Serial No.: 10/026,059

Examiner: Phan T. S.

Filing Date: December 18, 2001

Group Art Unit: 2841

Title: REDUCING THERMAL DRIFT IN ELECTRONIC COMPONENTS

COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria VA 22313-1450

TRANSMITTAL OF REPLY BRIEF

Sir:

Transmitted herewith is the Reply Brief with respect to the Examiner's Answer mailed on 7-10-06. This Reply Brief is being filed pursuant to 37 CFR 1.193(b) within two months of the date of the Examiner's Answer.

(Note: Extensions of time are not allowed under 37 CFR 1.136(a))

(Note: Failure to file a Reply Brief will result in dismissal of the Appeal as to the claims made subject to an expressly stated new grounds of rejection.)

No fee is required for filing of this Reply Brief.

If any fees are required please charge Deposit Account 50-1078.

Respectfully submitted,

John C. Eidson et al.

By

Paul H. Horstmann

Attorney/Agent for Applicant(s)

☒ I hereby certify that this correspondence is being deposited with the United States Postal Service as First Class mail in an envelope addressed to: Commissioner for Patents, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria VA 22313-1450.

Date of Deposit: 8-22-06

OR

☐ I hereby certify that this paper is being facsimile transmitted to the Commissioner for Patents on the date shown below.

Date of Facsimile:

Typed Name: Paul H. Horstmann

Signature: Paul H. Horstmann

Reg. No. 36,167

Date: 8-22-06

Telephone No. 310-376-0218



IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

In Re Application of:

John C. Eidson et al.

Application No: 10/026,059

Filed: 12-18-2001

For: REDUCING THERMAL DRIFT IN
ELECTRONIC COMPONENTS

Commissioner for Patents
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

Examiner: Phan T.S.

Art Unit: 2841

I hereby certify that this correspondence is being
deposited with the United States Postal Service
as first class mail with sufficient postage in an
envelope addressed to the Commissioner for
Patents, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-
1450 on

8-22-06

Date of Deposit

Paul H. Horstmann

Name of Person Mailing Correspondence

Paul H. Horstmann

Signature

8-22-06

Date

Appellant's Reply Brief

Dear Sir:

In response to the Examiner's Answer of 7-10-06, applicant/appellant submits this Reply Brief in connection with the above-referenced patent application which is on appeal to the Board of Patent Appeals and Interferences.

Remarks

The examiner has stated that

appellant merely claims increased mass to some unspecified degree, and one of ordinary skill can see that Luce teaches some increase by addition of the encapsulant.

(Page 5, lines 14-16, Examiner's Answer, 7-10-06). It is respectfully submitted that appellant does not merely claim increasing a thermal mass by an unspecified degree as stated by the examiner. Instead, claim 1 recites a

structure that “reduces a thermal drift” of an electronic component by increasing its thermal mass¹.

The examiner has stated that

Applicant acknowledges, see arguments, page 5, that the greater mass does reduce thermal drift by increasing the area, as shown by *Luce*... (Page 5, lines 17-19, Examiner’s Answer, 7-10-06). Appellant has not made such an “acknowledgment.” Instead, the assertion that the potting material 46 of *Luce* reduces thermal drift and increases thermal mass by providing a larger area for heat dissipation² was an assertion made by the examiner in the Office Action of 7-13-05 which appellant restated and then argued against on pages 5 and 6 of appellant’s Appeal Brief of 2-13-06.

The examiner has also stated that

applicant states, however, that there is no showing that the thermal dissipation of heat provided by the potting compound is greater than the atmosphere. (Page 5, lines 19-21, Examiner’s Answer, 7-10-06). Appellant has not made this statement either. Instead, appellant has stated that *Luce* uses the potting material 46 to seal the liquid crystal cell 32 from the atmosphere and to attach a wrist band rather than reduce thermal drift of an electronic component as claimed in claim 1 and that the examiner has not provided any evidence that the potting material 46 reduces thermal drift. (See pages 5-6 of appellant’s Appeal Brief of 2-13-06).

In response to appellant’s argument that *Luce* does not even teach that the liquid crystal cell 32 would benefit from thermal drift reduction as claimed in claim 1, the examiner has stated that the potting material 46 of *Luce* would expand the thermal mass of the chip component 34 and the LCD display of *Luce*. (Page 6, lines 3-6, Examiner’s Answer, 7-10-06). Appellant

¹ Appellant has shown that the potting material 46 of *Luce* does not reduce thermal drift of an electronic component by increasing its thermal mass as claimed in claim 1 and that a structure that increases a thermal mass as claimed in claim 1 runs contrary to the teachings in *Luce* for fabricating a miniaturized liquid crystal display device with minimal thickness.

² In any event, appellant does not claim reducing thermal drift by increasing an area for heat dissipation. Instead, claim 1 recites a structure that reduces a thermal drift of an electronic component by increasing its thermal mass.

submits that *Luce* does not teach that the chip component 34 and the LCD display of *Luce* would benefit from thermal drift reduction either.

In response to appellant's argument that *Luce* is not analogous prior art in view of appellant's invention as claimed in claim 1, the examiner has stated that

Applicant claims a circuit including an electronic component having an enclosure to protect the component. (Page 6, lines 17-18, Examiner's Answer, 7-10-06). It is respectfully submitted that an enclosure for an electronic component is a minor similarity between *Luce* and appellant's invention and that appellant's invention is not directed to an enclosure for an electronic component. Instead, appellant's invention is directed to reducing thermal drift in an electronic component (See claim 1 as well as the Title, Background, and Summary of appellant's specification) using a structure that surrounds an enclosure for the electronic component and that increases its thermal mass. In contrast, the teachings of *Luce* are directed to fabricating a liquid crystal display device of minimal thickness (*Luce*, col. 1, lines 42-44, 50-54, 62, and 66-68 and col. 2, lines 26-27) with no teaching of reducing thermal drift as claimed in claim 1.

CONCLUSION

Appellant again respectfully submits that claims 1, 3, 4, 6, 12, 13, 14, 15, 17, 18, and 20 are patentable under 35 U.S.C. §103 over the references cited by the Examiner and requests that the Board of Patent Appeals and Interferences direct allowance of the rejected claims.

Respectfully submitted,

By

Date: 8-22-06

Paul H. Horstmann

Paul H. Horstmann
Reg. No. 36,167